

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DAICHENA THOMAS,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

CLARK COUNTY, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:22-cv-00899-GMN-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 23]

Pending before the Court is a motion for appointment of guardian ad litem. Docket No. 23. The motion contains no points and authorities, no identification of the governing standard, and no meaningfully developed argument. Accordingly, the motion for appointment of guardian ad litem is **DENIED** without prejudice. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule 7-2(d).

In addition to the above, the motion itself (and numerous other documents throughout the docket) provide the full name of the minor at issue. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 23 at 1. It is the responsibility of the attorneys on the case to redact sensitive personal identifying information, including the full name of any minor. Local Rule IC 6-1(a)(2), (c). It is unclear why counsel have been violating this rule for the last year.<sup>1</sup> No later than May 30, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel must file a notice explaining why they have not abided by this rule in this case and what remedy (if any) they propose for rectifying the myriad instances of J.W.'s full name appearing on the docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 23, 2023

  
 Nancy J. Koppe  
 United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> The whole point of a motion for appointment of guardian ad litem is to ensure that a minor's interests are protected, so it is particularly unfortunate when such a filing itself fails to protect the minor's interest by providing his full name on the public docket in violation of the local rules.